

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ARTOSS, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

V.
ARTOSS GmbH, THOMAS GERBER
and WALTER GERIKE.

Defendant(s).

2:22-cv-1640-GMN-VCF

ORDER

Before the court is defendant Artoss GmbH's motion for leave to file under seal its emergency motion to compel deposition of MPA Consulting, LLC and motion for sanctions and to seal exhibits E, J-K, M-S, and V-W in the Appendix (ECF NO. 19).

The Ninth Circuit has emphasized a strong presumption in favor of access to court records and documents. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). This general right to public documents, however, is not absolute. *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978). Local Rule IA 10-5 explains that a party may file a document with the court under seal if accompanied by a motion for leave to file those documents under seal.

A party seeking to seal documents in support of a non-dispositive motion must only show “good cause” exists to seal the documents in question. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). Here, the good cause standard is met and the motion to seal is granted.

The parties have also stipulated to withdraw without prejudice Artoss GmbH's motion to compel deposition of MPA Consulting, LLC and motion for sanctions and the court has granted the parties' request (ECF No. 25, 29).

Accordingly, good cause appearing,

1 IT IS ORDERED that defendant Artoss GmbH's motion for leave to file under seal its emergency
2 motion to compel deposition of MPA Consulting, LLC and motion for sanctions and to seal exhibits E, J-
3 K, M-S, and V-W in the Appendix (ECF NO. 19), is GRANTED.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the sealed version of Artoss GmbH's motion to compel
5 deposition of MPA Consulting, LLC and motion for sanctions (ECF No. 5 and 6) are DENIED as MOOT.
6

7 DATED this 7th day of October 2022.


8 CAM FERENBACH
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25